

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

January 10, 2000

the name of the Transportation Committee. Since the previous speakers have addressed the substance, I'm going to do a little bit of that myself. The word "work" to me doesn't just mean the expenditure of energy and effort doing this or that. Maybe I would have to modify it with "meaningful", but the word "work" to me means purposeful effort directed toward achieving a reasonable goal. And I do not see any reasonableness in saying we're going to change the number of members on all the committees so we can divide them by three, without any regard to the amount of work to be done by the committee or any other thing, but because we're going to elevate some notion of geographic representation above every other consideration when it comes to how we're going to organize the committees and the structure that that organization will result in. It makes no sense to me whatsoever, and I'm not unmindful of the fact that Senator Wickersham, based on what I heard, is the one who came up with this notion. It still doesn't make any sense to me. It makes no sense from the standpoint of rationality and a functioning Legislature. I'm in the same position as the Chairman of the Executive Board. I'm opposed to all of the changes proposed except changing the name of the Transportation Committee. By way of the divisions of the question that I have offered and amendments which I will propose, I intend to take us on an odyssey related to the rules of the Legislature, and I want to show that this can be a rather exciting, engaging discussion. And because you-all don't pay attention, I will cue you with the word or the sentence, this is exciting, listen up. But whether anybody listens or not, there are things that I want to get into the record to vindicate myself as a legislator, myself as a person who has brain cells which are firing all the time, and not somebody who is just going to go along because a lot of effort was put into contriving a restructuring of the committee system and a reshuffling of the number of members so that you won't have conflicts if you accept all of this. That's not even the basis for restructuring. So that you don't have conflicts in the number of people on the committee, shouldn't we first put first things first? We should determine if these committees that we have ought to exist and, if we make a determination that the committees should exist in their present form or some other form, we can discuss what these committees are going to do and how many days a week it might take for them to reasonably do it and how many members there ought to be. But